

Serial No.: 09/752,100

Attorney's Docket No.:10559/322001/P9683

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 and 31-32 are pending, with claims 1, 11, 21, 25, 27 and 31 being independent. Claims 4 and 14 have been cancelled by this amendment without prejudice. Claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, 16, 21 and 32 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 4-6, 14-16, 25-28, 31 and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by DoubleVision 3.0 by Tridia. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over DoubleVision 3.0 by Tridia in view of Edwards (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,686). Claims 11-13 and 17-24 stand rejected for the reasons given for claims 1-3 and 7-10. These contentions have been obviated as described herein.

Independent claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended to include the claimed feature of now cancelled claims 4 and 14. Thus, the independent claims 1, 11, 21, 25, 27 and 31 are all now in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to depend from claim 1. Claims 15 and 16 have been amended to depend from claim 11.

Serial No.: 09/752,100

Attorney's Docket No.:10559/322001/P9683

Claim 32 has been amended to depend from claim 31 (correcting a typographical error). Dependent claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22-24, 26, 28 and 32 are all patentable based on their dependence from allowable base claims and based on their own merits.

It is respectfully suggested for all of these reasons, that the current rejection is totally overcome; that none of the cited art teaches or suggests the features which are now claimed, and therefore that all of these claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is thus respectfully requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that issue or comment. Because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Serial No.: 09/752,100

Attorney's Docket No.:10559/322001/P9683

Please apply any necessary charges or credits to Deposit
Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/17/04


William E. Hunter
Reg. No. 47,671
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10445766.doc